LABOR COMPLIANCE PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT

Format for Approved Program that contracts with Awarding Bodies to provide labor compliance enforcement

<u>REPORT</u> for the reporting period $\frac{7/1/2010}{\text{(mm/dd/yyyy)}}$ to $\frac{6/30/2011}{\text{(mm/dd/yyyy)}}$

Name of Labor Compliance Program (LCP): Labor Compliance Providers, Inc.						
2. LCP I.D. Number (assigned by DIR): LCP ID: 2002.00001	3. Date of Initial Approval: 1/17/2003					
 Contact person (include name, title, address, telephone, fax, and e James Reed, Labor Compliance Officer 1168 E. La Cadena Dr., #201; Riverside, CA 92507 P: (951) 686-3482 – F: (951) 346-0545 – Email: LCP_inc@msn.com 						
enforcement. If <i>none</i> , please proceed directly to item 7 and provi	ther Awarding Bodies with whom the LCP currently has a contract to provide compliance vide all requested information. Then complete the information below, and sign and submit stant455 Golden Gate Avenue, 10 th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.					
Adelanto School District Beaumont Unified Sc	chool District					
County of San Bernardino City of Oxnard						
Eastern Municipal Water District Mojave Unified School	pol District					
Oceanside Unified School District Rancho California Wa	fater District					
What suggestions do you have for the Department of Industrial Relations to better assist you with your program in the coming year? (attach additional sheets if necessary): 1. DEVELOP LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING GUIDELINES THAT REQUIRE CONTRACTORS TO ANNUALIZE THEIR BENEFITS 2. PUBLISH VIOLATIONS ON DIR WEBSITE TO ESTABLISH HISTORY OF VIOLATIONS FOR ASSITING THE FORFEITURE REQUEST PROCESS						
SUBMITTED BY:	August 30, 2011 Name and Title Date					

6. LC § 1771.5 enforcement activities (provide all information requested, attaching as many sheets as necessary, and *please complete separate forms for each Awarding Body covered in this report*).

Awarding Body: Adelanto School District

A. List projects handled by LCP within the past 12 months.

Project Name	Bid Advertisement Date	Prime Contractor	Contract Amount
Adelanto Elementary School	11/1/10	Multi-Prime: ACT, Inc.; Oakview Constructors; Kincaid; Construction Electric	\$1,253,500
El Mirage Elementary School	6/23/10	Multi-Prime: ASR; Silver Creek Industries; Dan Worley Plubming; Daniels Electrical; West Tech	\$5,246,640
George Elementary School	11/1/10	Multi-Prime: ACT, Inc.; Oakview Constructors; Kincaid; Construction Electric	\$1,314,000
Sheppard Middle School	11/1/10	Multi-Prime: ACT, Inc.; Oakview Constructors; Kincaid; Construction Electric	\$1,389,700
Total			\$9,203,840

Project Name	Affected Contractor (who directly employed the worker)	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Approval of Forfeiture Requested from Labor Commissioner?	Description of Violation
El Mirage ES	K & S Enterprises	\$22.08	\$22.08	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
El Mirage ES	ASR	\$334.68	\$334.68	Yes ✓ No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
El Mirage ES	JR DeFalco	\$51.20	\$51.20	_ Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
El Mirage ES	K & S Enterprises	\$394.63	\$394.63	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment (Misclassification)
George ES	Oakview Constructors	\$959.15	\$959.15	_Yes <u>✓</u> No	CCR 230.1; Apprentice working without Journeyman
El Mirage ES	JR DeFalco	\$53.40	\$53.40	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
George ES	Asbsestos Control Testing, Inc	\$1,209.00	\$1,209.00	_ Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
George ES	Oakview Constructors	\$272.88	\$272.88	Yes <u>✓</u> No	CCR 230.1; Apprentice working without Journeyman
Total		\$3,297.02	\$3,297.02		

C. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture not requested from the Labor Commissioner, please explain below.

Project Name	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Explanation
El Mirage ES	\$22.08	\$22.08	Below \$1000 threshold
El Mirage ES	\$334.68	\$334.68	Below \$1000 threshold
El Mirage ES	\$51.20	\$51.20	Below \$1000 threshold
El Mirage ES	\$394.63	\$394.63	Below \$1000 threshold
George ES	\$959.15	\$959.15	Below \$1000 threshold
El Mirage ES	\$53.40	\$53.40	Below \$1000 threshold
George ES	\$1,209.00	\$1,209.00	Contractor resolved before having to request for the review of forfeiture
George ES	\$272.88	\$272.88	Below \$1000 threshold
otal	\$3,297.02	\$3,297.02	

D. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture was requested from the Labor Commissioner, please provide the following:

Project		Amount	Assessed				Amount	Recovered		
Name	LC §1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total	LC § 1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total
None for period					W			3 - 4 - 2		10141
Total										

E. Identify cases that are or were the subject of LC § 1742 proceedings.

Project Name	Contractor	Nature of Violation	ODL Case #	Current Status
None for this period				1/44

F. Did you refer any contractor to the Labor Commissioner for debarment per LC § 1777.1?

Please check one: YES

✓ NO

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:

G. Did you refer any apprenticeship violation to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS)?

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral: JR DeFalco - 4/28/11

6. LC § 1771.5 enforcement activities (provide all information requested, attaching as many sheets as necessary, and *please complete separate forms for each Awarding Body covered in this report*).

Awarding Body: Beaumont Unified School District

A. List projects handled by LCP within the past 12 months.

Project Name	Bid Advertisement Date	Prime Contractor	Contract Amount	
BHS Classroom Expansion	2/23/11	Bogh Engineering	\$9,281,861.00	
Total			\$12,724,954	

B. Summary of all wages and penalties assessed and/or recovered.

Project Name	Affected Contractor (who directly employed the worker)	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Approval of Forfeiture Requested from Labor Commissioner?	Description of Violation	
BHS Athletic Complex Increment 1	Larry Jacinto Construction	\$144.40	\$144.40	Yes ✓ No	1174; Prevailing Wage Underpayment (Wrong Wage Determination)	
BHS Athletic Complex Increment 1	RPC Plumbing	\$1,416.00	\$1,416.00	Yes <u>✓</u> No	CCR 230.1; Apprentice working without Journeyman	
Total		\$1,560.40	\$1,560.40			

C. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture not requested from the Labor Commissioner, please explain below.

Project Name	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Explanation
BHS Athletic Complex Increment 1	\$144.40	\$144.40	Below \$1000 threshold
BHS Athletic Complex Increment 1	\$1,416.00	\$1,416.00	Contractor resolved before having to request for the review of forfeiture
Total	\$1,560.40	\$1,560.40	

D. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture was requested from the Labor Commissioner, please provide the following:

Project		Amount	Assessed			***	Amount	Recovered		
Name	LC §1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total	LC § 1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total
None for period	A Paracelaria			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				0		10111
Total										
	·						I	!		

E. Identify cases that are or were the subject of LC § 1742 proceedings.

Project Name	Contractor	Nature of Violation	ODL Case#	Current Status
None for this period				

F. Did you refer any contractor to the Labor Commissioner for debarment per LC § 1777.1?

Please check one:

Please check one:

YES

NO

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:

G. Did you refer any apprenticeship violation to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS)?

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:

6. LC § 1771.5 enforcement activities (provide all information requested, attaching as many sheets as necessary, and *please complete separate forms for each Awarding Body covered in this report*).

Awarding Body: County of San Bernardino

A. List projects handled by LCP within the past 12 months.

Project Name Bid Advertisement Date		Prime Contractor	Contract Amount	
Adelanto Detention Center ("ADC")	10/15/10	Lydig Construction	\$90,951,937	
Total				

B. Summary of all wages and penalties assessed and/or recovered.

Project Name	Affected Contractor (who directly employed the worker)	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Approval of Forfeiture Requested from Labor Commissioner?	Description of Violation
ADC	Muth Equipment Inc.	\$66.24	\$66.24	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
ADC	Muth Equipment Inc.	\$419.77	\$419.77	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
ADC	MVE	\$32.00	\$32.00	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
ADC	Great Salt Electric	\$83.20	\$83.20	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
ADC	Sierra Detention Systems	\$2,201.04	\$1,603.18	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
ADC	Muth Equipment Inc.	\$30,953.15	\$30,953.15	✓ YesNo	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
ADC	Mack	\$424.70	\$424.70	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
ADC	CHJ Inc.	\$208.98	\$208.98	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Total		\$34,389.08	\$33,791.22		

C. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture not requested from the Labor Commissioner, please explain below.

Project Name	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Explanation
ADC	\$66.24	\$66.24	Below \$1000 threshold
ADC	\$419.77	\$419.77	Below \$1000 threshold
ADC	\$32.00	\$32.00	Below \$1000 threshold
ADC	\$83.20	\$83.20	Below \$1000 threshold

ADC	\$2,201.04	\$1,603.18	Contractor resolved before having to request for the review of forfeiture
ADC	\$424.70	\$424.70	Below \$1000 threshold
ADC	\$208.98	\$208.98	Below \$1000 threshold
Total	\$3,435.93	\$2,838.07	

D. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture was requested from the Labor Commissioner, please provide the following:

Project		Amount	Assessed		····		Amount	Recovered	***************************************	
Name	LC §1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total	LC § 1776(g)		LC § 1813	Wages	Total
ADC		7425.00		30,953.15	\$30,953.15		7425.00		30,953.15	\$30,953.15
Total		7425.00		30,953.15	\$30,953.15		7425.00		30,953.15	\$30,953.15

E. Identify cases that are or were the subject of LC § 1742 proceedings.

Project Name	Project Name Contractor		ODL Case #	Current Status
None for this period			***************************************	***

I. Did you refer any contractor to the	Labor Commissioner for	debarment per LC § 1777.1?
--	------------------------	----------------------------

Please check one:

YES

NO

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:

G. Did you refer any apprenticeship violation to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS)?

YES

✓ NO

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:

6. LC § 1771.5 enforcement activities (provide all information requested, attaching as many sheets as necessary, and *please complete separate forms for each Awarding Body covered in this report*).

Awarding Body: City of Oxnard

A. List projects handled by LCP within the past 12 months.

Project Name	Bid Advertisement Date	Prime Contractor	Contract Amount
Bartolo Square South Phase 2 PW10-14	12/24/10	Toro Enterprises	\$2,478,801
College Park GS09-11	8/19/10	CS Legacy	\$11,066,475
Campus Park Gym GS09-13	8/5/10	Fast Track	\$1,103,559
Rice Avenue PW03-19	9/6/09	Security Paving	\$46,294,503
Total			\$63,225,143

Project Name	Affected Contractor (who directly employed the worker)	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Approval of Forfeiture Requested from Labor Commissioner?	Description of Violation
Rice/101	Hayward Baker	\$73.13	\$73.13	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Rice/101	Taft Electric	\$149.64	\$105.38	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Rice/101	Foundation Pile	\$787.41	\$787.41	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Rice/101	ProSweep	\$113.04	\$113.04	Yes ✓ No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment (OpEng Trust Fund)
Traffic Signals Rose @ Emerson	Taft Electric	\$28.15	\$28.15	Yes <u>✓</u> No	CCR 230.1; Apprentice working without Journeyman
Campus Park Gym	Roys Flooring	\$62.56	\$62.56	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment (OpEng Trust Fund)
College Park	MVE	\$16.00	\$16.00	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
College Park	Cal Fran Engineering	\$56.00	\$56.00	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Campus Park Gym	VAC Environmental	\$995.28	\$995.28	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Campus Park Gym	RT Contractor Corp	\$14.04	\$14.04	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment

Campus Park Gym	Tabasco Interiors	\$2,134.52	\$2,134.52	Yes	⊻ No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
College Park	Muth Equipment	\$21,982.16	\$21,982.16	✓ Yes	Ma	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Total		\$26,411.93	\$26,367.67			

C. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture not requested from the Labor Commissioner, please explain below.

Project Name	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Explanation
Rice/101	\$73.13	\$73.13	Below \$1000 threshold
Rice/101	\$149.64	\$105.38	Below \$1000 threshold
Rice/101	\$787.41	\$787.41	Below \$1000 threshold
Rice/101	\$113.04	\$113.04	Below \$1000 threshold
Traffic Signals Rose @ Emerson	\$28.15	\$28.15	Below \$1000 threshold
Campus Park Gym	\$62.56	\$62.56	Below \$1000 threshold
College Park	\$16.00	\$16.00	Below \$1000 threshold
College Park	\$56.00	\$56.00	Below \$1000 threshold
Campus Park Gym	\$995.28	\$995.28	Below \$1000 threshold
Campus Park Gym	\$14.04	\$14.04	Below \$1000 threshold
Campus Park Gym	\$2,134.52	\$2,134.52	Contractor resolved before having to request for the review of forfeiture
Total	\$4,429.77	\$4,385.51	

D. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture was requested from the Labor Commissioner, please provide the following:

Project		Amount	Assessed	•••			Amount	Recovered		
Name	LC §1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total	LC § 1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total
College Park		\$5375.00		\$24,825.48	\$30,200.48		\$4,650.00		\$21,982.16	\$26,632.16
Total		\$5375.00		\$24,825.48	\$30,200.48		\$4,650.00		\$21,982.16	\$26,632.16

E. Identify cases that are or were the subject of LC § 1742 proceedings.

Project Name	Contractor	Nature of Violation	ODL Case #	Current Status
None for this period				

		····	
	e Labor Commissioner for debarment NO or(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of		
1 E O	violation to the Division of Apprentic NO or(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of		

6. LC § 1771.5 enforcement activities (provide all information requested, attaching as many sheets as necessary, and *please complete separate forms for each Awarding Body covered in this report*).

Awarding Body: Oceanside Unified School District

A. List projects handled by LCP within the past 12 months.

Project Name	Bid Advertisement Date	Prime Contractor	Contract Amount
Libby Elementary School	7/30/10	Jaynes Corporation	\$14,600,000
Santa Margarita Elementary School	4/21/10	Echo Pacific	\$13,000,000
Music Building	3/8/11	Barnhart Balfour Beatty	\$3,985,000
North Terrace Elementary Mod	4/20/11	Echo Pacific	\$15,780,558
Total			\$47,365,558

Project Name	Affected Contractor (who directly employed the worker)	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Approval of Forfeiture Requested from Labor Commissioner?	Description of Violation
Santa Margarita ES	Casper Co	\$21.88	\$21.88	Yes ✓ No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment (Under-reported hours to Trust Fund)
Santa Margarita ES	Quality Reinforcing	\$21.45	\$21.45	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment (Under-reported hours to Trust Fund)
Santa Margarita ES	Iron Horse Grading	\$133.77	\$133.77	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	Straightline Engineering	\$470.13	\$554.38	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	Straightline Engineering	\$336.45	\$347.55	_Yes ✓ No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	La Jolla Electric	\$3,138.97	\$3,138.97	Yes _✓ No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	Challenger Sheetmetal	\$279.03	\$279.03	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	Straightline Engineering	\$122.50	\$122.50	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1813; Overtime Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	Straightline Engineering	\$827.74	\$827.74	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	Straightline Engineering	\$115.73	\$115.73	_Yes <u>✓</u> No	1813; Overtime Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	Casper Co	\$82.63	\$82.63	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment (Under-reported hours to Trust Fund)

Santa Margarita ES	CJR Concrete	\$751.10	\$751.10	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment (Under-reported hours to Trust Fund)
Santa Margarita ES	Parkwest Landscape	\$325.60	\$233.44	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	FSE, Inc	\$1,822.97	\$231.13	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; Prevailing Wage Underpayment
Libby ES	Mega Engineering	\$121.11	\$121.11	_Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Santa Margarita ES	Tile Marble Tech	\$13.91	\$13.91	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1815; Overtime Underpayment
Total		\$8,584.97	\$6,996.32		

C. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture not requested from the Labor Commissioner, please explain below.

Project Name	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Explanation
Santa Margarita ES	\$21.88	\$21.88	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$21.45	\$21.45	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$133.77	\$133.77	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$470.13	\$554.38	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$336.45	\$347.55	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$3,138.97	\$3,138.97	Contractor resolved before having to request for the review of forfeiture
Santa Margarita ES	\$279.03	\$279.03	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$122.50	\$122.50	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$827.74	\$827.74	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$115.73	\$115.73	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$82.63	\$82.63	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$751.10	\$751.10	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$325.60	\$233.44	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$1,822.97	\$231.13	Below \$1000 threshold
Libby ES	\$121.11	\$121.11	Below \$1000 threshold
Santa Margarita ES	\$13.91	\$13.91	Below \$1000 threshold
Fotal	\$8,584.97	\$6,996.32	

D. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture was requested from the Labor Commissioner, please provide the following:

Project		Amount	Assessed				Amount	Recovered		
Name	LC §1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total	LC § 1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total
None for this										+ 0 1 1 1
period.								-		
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

E. Identify cases that are or were the subject of LC § 1742 proceedings.

Project Name	Contractor	Nature of Violation	ODL Case #	Current Status
None for this period				

F. Did you refer any contractor to the Labor Commissioner for debarment per LC § 1777.1?

Please check one;

Please check one:

YES

NO

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:

G. Did you refer any apprenticeship violation to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS)?

Please check one:
YES ___ NO
If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral: Clevenger Masonry - 2/28/11

6. LC § 1771.5 enforcement activities (provide all information requested, attaching as many sheets as necessary, and *please complete separate forms for each Awarding Body covered in this report*).

Awarding Body: Rancho California Water District

A. List projects handled by LCP within the past 12 months.

Project Name	Bid Advertisement Date	Prime Contractor	Contract Amount
Vail Lake Transmission Main	10/2/09	LH Woods	7,995,555
Vail Lake Post Construction ReVegetation	10/21/10	Natures Image	2,000,000
Total			\$9,995,555

Project Name	Affected Contractor (who directly employed the worker)	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Approval of Forfeiture Requested from Labor Commissioner?	Description of Violation
Vail Lake Transmission Main	BHA, Inc.	\$570.38	\$570.38	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1775; wrong determination applied
Vail Lake Transmission Main	BHA, Inc.	\$91.13	\$91.13	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Non-payment of training fund contributions
Vail Lake Transmission Main	LH Woods	\$288,24	\$288.24	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1813; Overtime violation
Vail Lake Transmission Main	Sladden Engineering	\$403.33	\$403.33	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Non-payment of training fund contributions
Vail Lake Transmission Main	LH Woods	\$127.54	\$127.54	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1775; prevailing wage underpayment
Vail Lake Transmission Main	Seal Electric	\$536.49	\$536.49	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1775; prevailing wage underpayment
Vail Lake Transmission Main	BHA, Inc.	\$9.38	\$9.38	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1775; prevailing wage underpayment
Vail Lake Transmission Main	BHA, Inc.	\$66.75	\$66.75	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Non-payment of training fund contributions
Vail Lake Transmission Main	National Coating & Lining	\$947.04	\$947.04	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1775; prevailing wage underpayment
Vail Lake ReVegetation	Natures Image	\$1,750.01	REFERRED TO DAS	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Non-payment of training fund contributions
Total		\$4,790.29	\$3,040.28		

C. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture not requested from the Labor Commissioner, please explain below.

Project Name	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Explanation
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$570.38	\$570.38	Below \$1000 threshold
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$91.13	\$91.13	Below \$1000 threshold
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$288.24	\$288.24	Below \$1000 threshold
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$403.33	\$403.33	Below \$1000 threshold
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$127.54	\$127.54	Below \$1000 threshold
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$536.49	\$536.49	Contractor resolved before having to request for the review of forfeiture
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$9.38	\$9.38	Below \$1000 threshold
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$66.75	\$66.75	Below \$1000 threshold
Vail Lake Transmission Main	\$947.04	\$947.04	Below \$1000 threshold
Vail Lake ReVegetation	\$1,750.01	REFERRED TO DAS	Referred to DAS for resolution; as of 8/31/11 currently being reviewed by DAS
Total	\$4,790.29	\$3,040.28	

D. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture was requested from the Labor Commissioner, please provide the following:

Project		Amount	Assessed		***************************************		Amount	Recovered	····	
Name	LC §1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total	LC § 1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total
None for this								, ,		1 3 6 6 7
period.	60	40								
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
		1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>				

E. Identify cases that are or were the subject of LC § 1742 proceedings.

	Nature of Violation	ODL Case #	Current Status
		191	
_			

F. Did you refer any contractor to the Labor Commissioner for debarment per LC § 1777.1?
1. Did you refer any contractor to the Labor Commissioner for department per LC § 1///.1?
Please check one: YES NO
Please check one: YES NO If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:
G. Did you refer any apprenticeship violation to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS)? Please check one: VES. NO.
Please check one: YES NO If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral: Natures Image - 6/9/11
If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral: Natures Image $-6/9/11$

6. LC § 1771.5 enforcement activities (provide all information requested, attaching as many sheets as necessary, and *please complete separate forms for each Awarding Body covered in this report*).

Awarding Body: Eastern Municipal Water District

A. List projects handled by LCP within the past 12 months.

Project Name	Bid Advertisement Date	Prime Contractor	Contract Amount
Enchanted Heights Sewer Replacement	4/21/11	BRH Garver West	\$8,372,165
Menifee/Perris Desalters Iron Manganese Removal	2/2/11	Pacific Hydrotech	\$15,197,402
Total			\$23,569,567

B. Summary of all wages and penalties assessed and/or recovered.

Project Name	Affected Contractor (who directly employed the worker)	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Approval of Forfeiture Requested from Labor Commissioner?	Description of Violation
None for this period.				Yes <u>✓</u> No	
Total		\$0	\$0		

C. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture not requested from the Labor Commissioner, please explain below.

Project Name	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Explanation
None for this period.			
Total	\$0	\$0	

D. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture was requested from the Labor Commissioner, please provide the following:

Project		Amount	Assessed		***************************************		Amount	Recovered	17/010-	····
Name	LC §1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total	LC § 1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total
None for this										
period.										
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

E. Identify cases that are or were the subject of LC § 1742 proceedings. Project Name Contractor Nature of Violation ODL Case # Current Status None for this period F. Did you refer any contractor to the Labor Commissioner for debarment per LC § 1777.1? YES ✓ NO If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral: G. Did you refer any apprenticeship violation to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS)? YES ✓ NO If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:

6. LC § 1771.5 enforcement activities (provide all information requested, attaching as many sheets as necessary, and *please complete separate forms for each Awarding Body covered in this report*).

Awarding Body: Mojave Unified School District

A. List projects handled by LCP within the past 6 months.

Project Name	Bid Advertisement Date	Prime Contractor	Contract Amount
Mojave Elementary School Modernization 100, 300	5/21/07	Seward L. Schreder Construction	\$629,255
Mojave High School Modernization 800, 900, 100	5/21/07	Seward L. Schreder Construction	\$1,570,745
Total			\$2,200,000

Project Name	Affected Contractor (who directly employed the worker)	Amount Assessed	Amount Recovered	Approval of Forfeiture Requested from Labor Commissioner?	Description of Violation
Mojave Elementary	Signature Gates & Controls	\$54.72	\$54.72	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Mojave Elementary	Doortek Systems	\$470.24	\$470.24	Yes <u>✓</u> No	CCR 230.1; Apprentice working without Journeyman
Mojave Elementary	Seward L. Schreder	\$13.16	\$13.16	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Mojave High School	Mike Boban Construction	\$116.55	\$116.55	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Mojave ES 100, 300	Brian Howell Construction	\$38.49	\$38.49	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; prevailing wage underpayment
Mojave ES 100, 300	Frye Construction	\$221.21	\$221.21	Yes <u>✓</u> No	CCR 230.1; apprentice working without Journeyman
Mojave High School	J Noble Binns Plumbing	\$83.30	\$83.30	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1774; prevailing wage underpayment
Mojave High School	Frye Construction	\$137.95	\$137.95	Yes <u>✓</u> No	CCR 230.1; apprentice working without Journeyman
Mojave ES 100, 300	Cal Pacific Roofing	\$0.31	\$0.31	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Mojave High School	Thompson Painting	\$26.25	\$26.25	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Mojave ES 100, 300	Broken Drum Insulation	\$5.04	\$5.04	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment
Mojave ES 100, 300	IM Masonry	\$1.92	\$1.92	Yes <u>✓</u> No	1777.5; Training Fund Underpayment

	M.: 000 000 1100			Para State Control of the Control of	Yes ✓ No	CCR 230.1; Apprentice working without
	Mojave 800,900, 1100	J Noble Binns Plumbing	\$51.87	\$51.87		Journeyman
-	Total		\$1,221.01	\$1,221.01		

C. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture not requested from the Labor Commissioner, please explain below.

Design No.		Amount	The state of the s
Project Name	Amount Assessed	Recovered	Explanation
Mojave Elementary	\$54.72	\$54.72	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave Elementary	\$470.24	\$470.24	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave Elementary	\$13.16	\$13.16	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave High School	\$116.55	\$116.55	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave ES 100, 300	\$38.49	\$38.49	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave ES 100, 300	\$221,21	\$221.21	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave High School	\$83.30	\$83.30	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave High School	\$137.95	\$137.95	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave ES 100, 300	\$0.31	\$0.31	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave High School	\$26.25	\$26.25	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave ES 100, 300	\$5.04	\$5.04	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave ES 100, 300	\$1.92	\$1.92	Below \$1000 threshold
Mojave 800,900, 1100	\$51.87	\$51.87	Below \$1000 threshold
Total	\$1,221.01	\$1,221.01	

D. For any amount identified in item B for which approval of forfeiture was requested from the Labor Commissioner, please provide the following:

Project		Amount	Assessed				Amount	Recovered		
Name	LC §1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total	LC § 1776(g)	LC § 1775	LC § 1813	Wages	Total
None for period								0		10111
Total				******					···	
· L				···	<u> </u>					

LCP-AR3 E. Identify cases that are or were the subject of LC § 1742 proceedings. Project Name Contractor Nature of Violation ODL Case# Current Status None for this period F. Did you refer any contractor to the Labor Commissioner for debarment per LC § 1777.1? Please check one: Please check one:

YES

NO

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral: G. Did you refer any apprenticeship violation to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS)? Please check one: Please check one:

YES

NO

If yes, identify affected contractor(s) or subcontractor(s) and date(s) of referral:

- 7. On a separate sheet, provide a certificate of compliance with conflict of interest disclosure requirements by employees and consultants who participate in making governmental decisions (as defined under 2 CCR § 18701) along with the names of LCP personnel who are filing disclosure statements and the agencies with which those statements are being filed.
- 8. Please update the following information per 8 CCR § 16426(a)(2), (3) and (5) disclosure requirement:
- A. Identify the geographical areas in which the program intends to operate and the identity of any public agencies not previously identified in this report with which the program intends to contract to provide labor compliance enforcement.

Orange County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, San Diego County, and Ventura County

B. State whether the entity shares personnel, management, ownership or other close affiliation with any of the following: (1) any contractor or subcontractor that within the preceding five years has been awarded a public works contract within the geographical area in which the program operates or intends to operate or with any public agency with which the program has contracted or intends to contract to provide labor compliance enforcement; (2) any person or entity who has been the surety on such a contract; (3) any joint labor-management committee established pursuant to the Federal Labor Management Cooperation Act of 1978 (section 175a of Title 29 of the United States Code); or (4) any person or entity who has represented workers employed in the same or similar classifications as those employed for such a contract and who has been engaged in (i) an organizational campaign under the National Labor Relations Act with contractors competing for such contracts or (ii) a jurisdictional dispute with another collective bargaining representative of workers utilized for such contracts.

For each affiliation, please provide the name, address, telephone number, and principal contact person for the person or entity; please identify shared personnel, management, and ownership; and if applicable, please provide a short description of the nature and extent of any other close affiliation:

Labor Compliance Providers, Inc. is the sister company of the Center for Contract Compliance, a labor-management committee formed under the Labor Management Act of 1978. The Center for Contract Compliance is located at 4399 Santa Anita Ave., El Monte, California. James Reed is the Executive Director for the Center for Contract Compliance and Administrator for Labor Compliance Providers, Inc.; phone number (951) 712-5197

C. Identify the attorney or law firm available to provide legal support for the LCP, and whether the persons or firms providing that support also represent any contractor, subcontractor, surety, or worker representative referred to in the preceding item.

Attorney/Law Firm Name (include address, contact person, and telephone number)

Dwayne McKenzie; Cox, Castle & Nicholson LLP; 2049 Century Park East 28th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90067; Phone: (310) 277-4222

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Labor Compliance Providers, Inc. is hereby issuing this certificate of compliance with the conflict of interest disclosure requirements by employees and consultants who participate in making governmental decisions (as defined under 2 CCR §18701).

The following Labor Compliance Providers, Inc. personnel have filed disclosure statements with the below listed agencies:

<u>Personnel</u>	Agencies
James Reed	Adelanto School District
James Reed	Beaumont Unified School District
James Reed	County of San Bernardino
James Reed	City of Oxnard
James Reed	Eastern Municipal Water District
James Reed	Mojave Unified School District
James Reed	Oceanside Unified School District
James Reed	Rancho California Water District